IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA COLUMBIA DIVISION

| Donney Shawyn Whyte Council, |) | |
|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| Plaintiff, |) | C.A. No. 3:11-1088-JMC |
| Timitiii, |) | |
| v. |) | ORDER |
| |) | |
| The South Carolina; SCDC 16-3-20 c |) | |
| Century Fox; 16-3-21 Century Fox @ 4; |) | |
| and S Car Court Trials Cases, |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |
| |) | |

This matter is now before the court upon the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation [Doc. # 8], filed on June 24, 2011, recommending Plaintiff's complaint be dismissed *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process. The Report and Recommendation sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and the court incorporates the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation without a recitation.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objections are made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the Magistrate Judge's recommendation or

3:11-cv-01088-JMC Date Filed 07/11/11 Entry Number 10 Page 2 of 2

recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

DISCUSSION

Plaintiff filed no objections to the Report and Recommendation. In the absence of objections

to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, this court is not required to provide an

explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir.

1983). Rather, "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo*

review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in

order to accept the recommendation." Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315

(4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note). Furthermore, failure to file

specific written objections to the Report and Recommendation results in a party's waiver of the right

to appeal from the judgment of the District Court based upon such recommendation. 28 U.S.C. §

636(b)(1); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985);

United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the

Court **ACCEPTS** the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation [Doc. #8] and incorporates

it herein. Therefore, for the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is **Ordered** that this

complaint is **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ J. Michelle Childs
United States District Judge

United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina July 11, 2011

2